

REMARKS

1

2 Claims 1-15 have been presented for examination in the
3 above-identified U.S. Patent Application.

4

5 Claims 1-3, 5-15 have been rejected in Office Action
6 dated June 26, 2006.

7

8 Claim 4 has been objected to as depending from a
9 rejected Claim.

10

11 Claims 1, 7, and 12 have been amended by this
12 Amendment A.

13

14 Claims 1-15 are still in the application and
15 reconsideration of the Application is hereby respectfully
16 requested.

17

18 Referring to Section on Page 2 of the Office Action
19 dated June 26, 2006 entitled "Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C.
20 101", Claims 7-11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101
21 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory
22 subject matter. Examiner states, "The claims merely
23 manipulate the information without producing a tangible
24 result, therefore they are drawn to non-statutory subject
25 matter." Claim 7 relates to signals from a target
26 processor that are forwarded to a host processor. This
27 activity is familiar to anyone having ordinary skill in the
28 art of test and debug procedures. Claim 6 has been amended
29 to include explicitly this limitation. In particular, the
30 trace signals are, in the amended Claim, applied to a
31 communication line for transmission to a hoist processing
32 unit. The host processing unit, as is known to those of

1 ordinary skill in the art, is the apparatus used to
2 determine whether the operation of the target processor is
3 in error. Therefore, rejection of Claims 7-11 under 35
4 U.S.C. 101 has been answered by amendment.
5

6 Referring to the Section on Page 2 of the Office
7 Action entitled "Claim Objections," Claims 1-6 are objected
8 to because of the use of the symbol "/" renders the Claims
9 indefinite. Applicant has amended Claims 1-6 to eliminate
10 any use of the "/" symbol. Therefore, objection with
11 respect to Claims 1-6 has been answered by amendment.
12

13 Claims 13-14 are objected to because of the
14 recitation, "first" and "second" control signals lacks
15 antecedent action in the Claims. Claim 12, from which
16 Claims 13 and 14 depend, has been amended to include the
17 generation of "a first and a second" control signal. This
18 amendment provides the antecedent basis for the first and
19 second signal references in Claims 12 and 14. Therefore,
20 objection to Claims 13 and 14 because of the reference to
21 first and second control signals has been answered by
22 amendment.
23

24 Referring to the Section on Page 2 of the Office
25 Action entitled "Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C. 102", Claims 1-
26 3 and 4-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as
27 being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,859,891 issued in the
28 name of Edwards et al, herein after referred to as Edwards.
29 Before discussing the Edwards reference in detail, the
30 subject matter of the present Application will be
31 summarized. The invention disclosed by the Application
32 relates to the transmission of data in a test and debug
33 procedure to a last processor wherein the data can be
34 analyzed to determine the accuracy of the target processor

1 operation. In the present invention, the communication of
2 the test and debug procedure is performed from the target
3 processor to the host processor over a communication line.
4 The communication bus is not a matter of design choice but
5 has separate problems and advantages. The advantages
6 involve flexibility because any number of target processors
7 can be tested by a single host processor. The
8 disadvantages include additional apparatus required to
9 interact with the communication bus and relatively low band
10 width of the communication bus. With respect to the
11 additional apparatus, Fig. 3 illustrates the presence of
12 packet assembly units. The packet assembly units place the
13 data in a format for transmission over the communication
14 bus. Equally important is the relatively slow speed of the
15 communication bus for the transmission of data. This slow
16 speed is the result of competition for access to the bus
17 and the relatively slow operating rate for data transmitted
18 over the communication bus. As a consequence, considerable
19 thought has to be given to what trace streams are to be
20 transmitted over the bus so that the most important test
21 and debug data has priority. Both the encoding of the
22 trace streams and even the selection of the trace streams
23 are important and require input from the user. Multiple
24 Figures are provided in the Specification of the
25 Application illustrating the selection and encoding of the
26 trace streams to provide enablement of the invention.
27 Claims 1, 7, and 12 have been amended by this Amendment A
28 to include the limitation of the transmission of trace
29 streams over a communication bus.

30

31 Referring now to the Edwards reference, a dedicated
32 link is provided between the target processor and the host
33 processor. This implementation is described in the
34 Abstract beginning on the second line. In addition, the

1 transmission of data over the dedicated link is at the
2 speed of the internal processor, cf. Column 2 beginning at
3 Line 16. And, the implementation of the data link
4 described by Edwards can be augmented or contract by adding
5 or subtracting communication lines, cf. Column 2, Lines 44-
6 47. In contradistinction, the present invention has a
7 single and relatively slow communication path over which
8 the trace streams, encoded and complete, are sent. Thus,
9 the choices that are explicitly made to provide required
10 trace streams in the present Application are not present in
11 the Edwards reference. In fact, in view of the differences
12 engendered by dedicated lines as contrasted with the single
13 communication bus, Edwards may be considered non-analogous
14 art. Edwards does not indicate the procedures for
15 selecting formats and procedures that are found in the
16 present Application that are required for enablement. This
17 omission is because in the system envisioned by Edwards,
18 the selection of these procedures and parameters does not
19 have the similar limitation to the communication bus.
20 Consequently, the Edwards reference is not relevant art in
21 the rejection of the Claims of Application.

22 Therefore, rejection of Claims 1-3 and 5-11 under 35
23 U.S.C. 102(b) over Edwards is respectfully traversed.
24
25

CONCLUSION

1 In view of the foregoing discussion and the foregoing
2 amendments, it is believed that Claims 1-15 are now in
3 condition for allowance and allowance of Claims 1-15 is
4 respectfully requested. Applicants hereby respectfully
5 request a timely Notice of Allowance be issued for this
6 Application.

Respectfully submitted,



William W. Holloway
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 26,182

Texas Instruments Incorporated
PO Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(281) 274-4064